



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,920	12/28/2001	Juan G. Revilla	10559-566001 P12728	3816
20985	7590	07/15/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081				THAI, TUAN V
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2186				

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/040,920	REVILLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tuan V. Thai	2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2186

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed April 26, 2005. This amendment has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-48 remain pending in the application. Claims 41-48 are newly added.
2. The rejection of claims 11-14 and 34 under 35 USC § 112 second paragraph is withdrawn due to the amendment filed April 26, 2005.
3. Newly submitted claim 48 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

The original claims 1-40 and 41-47 (newly added) has separate utility and being directed to a system and method for access memory utilizing address mapping/translation thru the implementation of local address memory and local cache, and is not limited for use with a method of memory page addressing by examining an upper bits of the address, identifying a page in which the address resides by checking local memory page descriptor according to claim 48. Similarly, the method of memory page addressing of the newly added claim 48 can be used as a memory page indexing in a proxy cache network or other computer

Art Unit: 2186

network systems, and is not restricted for use with the system and method for access memory utilizing address mapping/translation thru the implementation of local address memory and local cache of the original group of claims 1-47. Since Applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 48 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-47 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the

Art Unit: 2186

international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6, 11-13, 15-16, 32 and 40-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lyon (USPN: 6,470,437);

As per claim 1; Lyon discloses the invention as claimed including a method comprises receiving a request (cache access) for access to a memory location by presenting a virtual tag to CAM (e.g. see column 2, lines 49-50; column 5, line 44); identifying a memory block including the memory location (e.g. see column 2, lines 50-52); Lyon further discloses examining a local memory descriptor (TLB HIT bit) associated with the memory block (TLB RAM memory block) and accessing a local addressable memory (TLB) in response to the TLB hit bit to retrieve physical tag from TLB RAM, the TLB hit bits are then compared to cache tag to determined cache hit or cache miss (e.g. see column 2, line 63 bridging column 3, line 1; also see column 2, lines 52-56); Lyon further discloses the local addressable memory (TLB) is within the cache which is at the same level of memory as the cache as being claimed (e.g. see figure 3, column 5, lines 28 et seq.); wherein a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since, as known in the memory storage art, TLB is a part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is presented to the TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein

Art Unit: 2186

mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag within the TLB is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52;

As per claim 2, Lyon discloses in response to TLB hit or the memory location existing in the local addressable memory (TLB), accessing the memory location, for example, a physical tag is then retrieved from the TLB RAM 118 (e.g. see column 5, lines 10-13);

As per claim 3, generating an illegal access violation exception in response to the memory location not existing in the local addressable memory (TLB) is equivalently taught by Lyon as when there is a TLB MISS condition (memory location is not in the TLB), the virtual hit vector 214 generates all binary "0s" (illegal access violation) (e.g. see column 3, lines 17 et seq.);

As per claim 4, Lyon discloses in response to TLB/cache miss in which the memory block is not in the local addressable memory, accessing a lower (local) cache within a processor (e.g. see column 1, lines 33-35; column 5, lines 44-46);

As per claim 5, Lyon discloses virtual tag address 207 is received by the virtual CAM 208 for cache access request (e.g. see column 5, lines 44 et seq.);

As per claim 6, Lyon further discloses identifying page address assignment for virtual addresses (e.g. see column 2,

Art Unit: 2186

lines 8 et seq.; also see column 5, lines 59 et seq.);

As per claim 11, Lyon discloses the invention as claimed including a method comprises receiving a request (cache access) for access to a memory location by presenting a virtual tag to CAM (e.g. see column 2, lines 49-50; column 5, line 44); identifying a memory block including the memory location (e.g. see column 2, lines 50-52); Lyon further discloses routing the request to one of a local addressable memory and a local cache as being equivalent to the virtual tag 207 are routed and presented to the virtual CAM 208 to generate a virtual TLB hit vector 214 (e.g. see column 5, lines 44 et seq.); Lyon also discloses accessing a local addressable memory (TLB) in response to the TLB hit bit to retrieve physical tag from TLB RAM, the TLB hit bits are then compared to cache tag to determined cache hit or cache miss (e.g. see column 2, line 63 bridging column 3, line 1; also see column 2, lines 52-56) wherein the local addressable memory (TLB) is within the cache which is at the same level of memory as the cache as being claimed (e.g. see figure 3, column 5, lines 28 et seq.); wherein a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since, as known in the memory storage art, TLB is a part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is presented to the TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag within

Art Unit: 2186

the TLB is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52;

As per claim 12, Lyon further discloses accessing the local addressable memory (TLB) as being equivalent to the TLB RAM 118 is accessed for retrieving of the physical tag in response to TLB hit or the memory location existing in the local addressable memory (TLB) (e.g. see column 5, lines 10-13);

As per claim 13, generating an illegal access violation exception in response to the memory location not existing in the local addressable memory (TLB) is equivalently taught by Lyon as when there is a TLB MISS condition (memory location is not in the TLB), the virtual hit vector 214 generates all binary "0s" (illegal access violation) (e.g. see column 3, lines 17 et seq.);

As per claim 15, Lyon discloses the invention as claimed including an apparatus comprising an execution unit is taught as processor known to be embed in the system of Lyon, also being disclosed in the background of Lyon's invention (e.g. see column 1, lines 34 et seq.); an local addressable memory is taught as TLB within a cache memory (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.), wherein a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since, as known in the memory storage art, TLB is a part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is

Art Unit: 2186

presented to the TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag within the TLB is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52; a separate local cache as the same level as the TLC (e.g. see figures 1-3 and column 4, lines 22 et seq.); a local memory controller is known to be embed in the system of Lyon for identifying a memory block including the memory location in response to receiving a request for access to the memory location from the processor (e.g. see column 2, lines 50-52), and routing the request to one of a local addressable memory and a local cache as being equivalent to the virtual tag 207 are routed and presented to the virtual CAM 208 to generate a virtual TLB hit vector 214 (e.g. see column 5, lines 44 et seq.); Lyon also discloses accessing a local addressable memory (TLB) in response to the TLB hit bit to retrieve physical tag from TLB RAM, the TLB hit bits are then compared to cache tag to determined cache hit or cache miss (e.g. see column 2, line 63 bridging column 3, line 1; also see column 2, lines 52-56);

As per claim 16, Lyon discloses a plurality of local memory descriptors as being equivalent to the plurality of TLB hit bits associated with TLB memory blocks (e.g. see column 2, lines 65-66; column 8, lines 14 et seq.);

As per claim 32; Lyon discloses the invention as claimed

Art Unit: 2186

including a method comprises receiving a request (cache access) for access to a memory location by presenting a virtual tag to CAM (e.g. see column 2, lines 49-50; column 5, line 44); identifying a memory block including the memory location (e.g. see column 2, lines 50-52); Lyon further discloses examining a local memory descriptor (TLB HIT bit) associated with the memory block (TLB RAM memory block) and accessing a local addressable memory (TLB) in response to the TLB hit bit to retrieve physical tag from TLB RAM, the TLB hit bits are then compared to cache tag to determine cache hit or cache miss (e.g. see column 2, line 63 bridging column 3, line 1; also see column 2, lines 52-56). Lyon discloses in response to TLB/cache miss in which the memory block is not in the local addressable memory, accessing a lower (local) cache within a processor (e.g. see column 1, lines 33-35; column 5, lines 44-46); wherein the local addressable memory (TLB) is within the cache which is at the same memory level as the cache as being claimed (e.g. see figure 3, column 5, lines 28 et seq.); wherein a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since, as known in the memory storage art, TLB is a part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is presented to the TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag within the TLB is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in

Art Unit: 2186

the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52.

As per claim 40, Lyon discloses his memory system can be arranged in the hierarchical structure having local cache as L1 cache as being claimed (e.g. see column 1, lines 19 et seq.; also see figures 1-3).

As per claims 41 and 42, Lyon discloses accessing a local address memory only results in a TLB miss or TLB hit (e.g. see column 2, lines 63-66), not (never) CACHE HIT as being claimed unless TLB hit occurs in which the TLB hit bits are then compared to a prevalidated cache tag to determine cache hit/miss. In addition, TLB is a real type of memory being implemented as Random access memory (RAM) (e.g. see column 2, line 53);

As per claims 43 and 44, Lyon discloses information at the memory location is **only** within the TLB RAM when the virtual tag is presented to the CAM in the TLB, and the location is exclusively located in the TLB or local addressable memory (e.g. see column 2, lines 49-52);

As per claim 45, it's known in the memory storage art and further disclosed by Lyon that the TLB RAM has and address space (e.g. see column 1, lines 63 et seq.; column 3, line 2); wherein the memory location is known exclusively mapped to the TLB address space, this concept of further known as fully associative mapping that is well-known in the art and disclosed by Lyon (e.g.

Art Unit: 2186

see column 2, lines 15-18);

As per claim 46, the further limitation of wherein access to a non-existent address in the local addressable memory results in an illegal-access exception is taught as Lyon as TLB miss (e.g. see column 5, line 8);

Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7-10, 14, 17-31, 33-39 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon (USPN: 6,470,437);

As per claim 7; as being detailed above in claim 1, Lyon discloses the local addressable memory is taught as translation lookaside buffer (TLB) (e.g. TLB 114 having TLB RAM 118, e.g. see figure 2; column 5, lines 6 et seq.). Lyon; however, does not particularly discloses the TLB RAM memory being implemented as SRAM type of memory. First of all, it should be noted that SRAM is a commonly-known memory type in the memory storage art; secondly, Applicant neither disclosing in the specification nor claiming in the current invention that different type of cache

Art Unit: 2186

would change or vary the operation of system. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to implement Lyon's cache as SRAM type of cache, since SRAM cache is known in the art as cheaper than most other type of memories; in addition, by implementing cache memory as SRAM type, memory refresh is not required, therefore being advantageous.

As per claims 8, 9 and 10; Lyon discloses local memory descriptor (Cacheability/Translation Protection Lookaside Buffer as equivalent to the Translation Lookaside Buffer TLB hit bits are examined and compared to a prevalidated cache tag to determine if a cache hit or cache miss has occurred (e.g. see column 2, line 66 bridging column 3, line 1);

As per claims 14 and 17; as being detailed above in claim 1, Lyon discloses the local addressable memory is taught as translation lookaside buffer (TLB) (e.g. TLB 114 having TLB RAM 118, e.g. see figure 2; column 5, lines 6 et seq.). Lyon, however, does not particularly discloses the TLB RAM memory being implemented as SRAM type of memory. First of all, it should be noted that SRAM is a commonly-known memory type in the memory storage art; secondly, Applicant neither disclosing in the specification nor claiming in the current invention that different type of cache would change or vary the operation of system. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2186

ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to implement Lyon's cache as SRAM type of cache, since SRAM cache is known in the art as cheaper than most other type of memories; in addition, by implementing cache memory as SRAM type, memory refresh is not required, therefore being advantageous.

As per claim 18; Lyon discloses local memory descriptor as equivalent to the Translation Lookaside Buffer TLB hit bit for indicating whether an associated memory block resides in the translation lookaside buffer TLB hit/miss (e.g. see column 2, line 66 bridging column 3, line 1; column 5, lines 44 et seq.);

As per claim 19, Lyon discloses the invention as claimed including an apparatus comprising an execution unit is taught as processor known to be embed in the system of Lyon, also being disclosed in the background of Lyon's invention (e.g. see column 1, lines 34 et seq.); an local addressable memory is taught as TLB within a cache memory (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.), wherein a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since, as known in the memory storage art, TLB is a part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is presented to the TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52; a

Art Unit: 2186

separate local cache as the same level as the TLC (e.g. see figures 1-3 and column 4, lines 22 et seq.); a local memory controller is known to be embed in the system of Lyon for identifying a memory block including the memory location in response to receiving a request for access to the memory location from the processor (e.g. see column 2, lines 50-52), and routing the request to one of a local addressable memory and a local cache as being equivalent to the virtual tag 207 are routed and presented to the virtual CAM 208 to generate a virtual TLB hit vector 214 (e.g. see column 5, lines 44 et seq.); Lyon also discloses accessing a local addressable memory (TLB) in response to the TLB hit bit to retrieve physical tag from TLB RAM, the TLB hit bits are then compared to cache tag to determined cache hit or cache miss (e.g. see column 2, line 63 bridging column 3, line 1; also see column 2, lines 52-56), a system bus coupled to the processor and different interface unit is known to be embedded in the system of Lyon (e.g. see figures 1-4). Lyon discloses the invention as claimed except for the system comprises a universal serial Bus interface. First of all, USB interface is notorious old and well known in the art for its ability to support plug and play operation, allowing easy installation of peripherals and faster data transfer rate. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention as made to implement an USB interface in the

Art Unit: 2186

system of Lyon in order to arrive at Applicant's current invention. In doing so, it would allow the system of Lyon to serve broader range of applications, and to provide Lyon's system the ability (a) to simplify connection of external devices, and (b) to support plug and play operation, therefore being advantageous.

As per claim 20, Lyon discloses the local addressable memory is taught as translation lookaside buffer (TLB) (e.g. TLB 114 having TLB RAM 118, e.g. see figure 2; column 5, lines 6 et seq.). Lyon, however, does not particularly disclose the TLB RAM memory being implemented as SRAM type of memory. First of all, it should be noted that SRAM is a commonly-known memory type in the memory storage art; secondly, Applicant neither disclosing in the specification nor claiming in the current invention that different type of cache would change or vary the operation of system. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to implement Lyon's cache as SRAM type of cache, since SRAM cache is known in the art as cheaper than most other type of memories; in addition, by implementing cache memory as SRAM type, memory refresh is not required, therefore being advantageous.

As per claims 21-24 and 25-27; Lyon discloses the invention as claimed, detailed above with respect to claims 1-10 and 11-14; Lyon however does not particularly disclose a computer-readable

Art Unit: 2186

medium of instructions to be implemented on a computer as being claimed in claims 21-24 and 25-27. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that computer readable medium (i.e., floppy, cd-rom, etc.) carrying computer-executable instructions for implementing a method, because it would facilitate the transporting and installing of the method on other systems, is generally well-known in the art. For example, a copy of the Microsoft Windows operating system can be found on a cd-rom from which Windows can be installed onto other systems, which is a lot easier than running a long cable or hand typing the software onto another system. The examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to put Lyon's program on a computer readable medium, because it would facilitate the transporting, installing and implementing of Lyon's program on other systems.

As per claim 28, Lyon discloses the invention as claimed including a method comprises accessing a local memory (translation lookaside buffer, TLB; e.g. see column 5, lines 44 et seq.), Lyon further discloses the local memory (TLB) is within the cache which is at the same memory level as the cache wherein the local memory is considered an extension of local memory address space (e.g. see figure 3, column 5, lines 28 et seq.); wherein a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since, as known in the

Art Unit: 2186

memory storage art, TLB is a part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is presented to the TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag within the TLB is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52. Lyon discloses the invention as claimed except for configuring the local memory as SDRAM. First of all, it should be noted that SRAM is a commonly-known memory type in the memory storage art; secondly, Applicant neither disclosing in the specification nor claiming in the current invention that different type of cache would change or vary the operation of system. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to implement Lyon's cache as SRAM type of cache, since SRAM cache is known in the art as cheaper than most other type of memories; in addition, by implementing cache memory as SRAM type, memory refresh is not required, therefore being advantageous.

As per claim 29, Lyon discloses by setting the TLB hit bit to "1" indicating the location of the virtual tag 207 in the virtual CAM (extending the local virtual memory space) (e.g. see column 5, lines 47-49);

As per claims 30 and 31; Lyon discloses the invention as claimed, detailed above with respect to claims 28-29. Lyon

Art Unit: 2186

however does not particularly disclose a computer-readable medium of instructions to be implemented on a computer as being claimed in claims 21-24 and 25-27. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that computer readable medium (i.e., floppy, cd-rom, etc.) carrying computer-executable instructions for implementing a method, because it would facilitate the transporting and installing of the method on other systems, is generally well-known in the art. For example, a copy of the Microsoft Windows operating system can be found on a cd-rom from which Windows can be installed onto other systems, which is a lot easier than running a long cable or hand typing the software onto another system. The examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to put Lyon's program on a computer readable medium, because it would facilitate the transporting, installing and implementing of Lyon's program on other systems.

As per claims 33-39, Lyon discloses his memory system can be arranged in the hierarchical structure having local cache as L1 cache as being claimed (e.g. see column 1, lines 19 et seq.; also see figures 1-3);

As per claim 47, Lyon discloses the invention as claimed, Lyon discloses TLB RAM is implemented as part of the cache memory, wherein TLB RAM stores prevalidated cache tag which can be accessed during execution (e.g. see column 2, lines 65 et

Art Unit: 2186

seq.). Lyon however do not particularly disclose the TLB RAM (local address memory as being claimed) is implemented as separate and different from the cache. First of all, Lyon clearly discloses many variations and/or modifications are possible within the scope of the invention (e.g. see column 11, lines 30 et seq.); in addition, it should be noted that implementation of separated TLB (or standalone TLB) from the cache is well-known in the art. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the current invention was made to implement the local addressable memory separately from the cache; in doing so, it would avoid of merging data from both TLB and cache directory directly for comparison, this would allow a physically partitioned design more easily; it further allows the cache directory search to be separated from the TLB lookup which results to enhancement of system throughput, therefore being advantageous.

8. As per remark, Examiner would like to emphasize that the local memory of Lyon is an TLB that is implemented as random access memory which is structurely distinguish from the cache itself (e.g. see column 2, lines 53 et seq.); in addition, the further limitation of a portion of a system memory is mapped to the local addressable memory is taught by Lyon since as being implemented as part of the cache (e.g. see column 4, lines 22 et seq.) wherein it's known that virtual address is presented to the

Art Unit: 2186

TLB for addressing mapping/translation wherein mapping of physical tag from system memory and virtual tag within the TLB is known to take place, this being illustrated by Lyon in the sequence of four operations starting at column 2, lines 48-52.

9. Applicant's arguments filed April 26, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan V. Thai whose telephone number is (571)-272-4187. The examiner can normally be reached on from 6:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mathew M. Kim can be reached on (571)-272-4182. The fax phone number for the

Application/Control Number: 10/040,920


-Page 21-

Art Unit: 2186

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is
571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVT/July 10, 2005


Tuan V. Thai
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Group 2100